APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,311	01/23/2004	Luis Felipe Cabrera	13768.484	6532

7590   09/11/2007

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN NYDEGGER
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, PHILLIP H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/763,311	CABRERA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phillip H. Nguyen	2191	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 June 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _27_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the amendment filed on 6/22/2007.

2.   Claims 1,3,4,6,8,9,11,14,16,17,19,21,22,24,31 and 32 have been amended.

3.   Claim 27 has been canceled.

4.   Claims 1-32 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are

not deemed persuasive.

Applicant asserts on page 13 of the amendment that Southam fails to teach or

suggest *transitioning to other code that represents the state to transition to in response*

to transmission of the valid transmission message. Furthermore, Southam fails to teach

or suggest *transitioning to other code that represents the state to transition to in*

response to reception of the valid message.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the allegations as argued. Southam

teaches "*the mock client 102 sends a request to the testee service 104. After the*

request is received, the testee service 104 directs a related request to an actual network

service 108...then redirected (rerouted) to a mock network service 110 that emulates

operation of the actual network service 108 to which the testee service 104 attempted to

send its request...returns an appropriate response to the testee service 104, a separate

response may then returned to the mock client 102..." (see at least col. 7, lines 28-44).

According to Southam, testee service 104 is the other code that represents the state to

transition to in response to transmission and reception of the valid transmission

message.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111[R-1] Interpretation of Claim-

Broadest Reasonable Interpretation. During patent examination, the pending claims

must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during the prosecution

and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claims once

issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,

550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Claim Objections

6.   The amendment filed on 6/22/2007 overcomes the objection to claim 27 of

previous office action. Therefore, the objection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7.   The amendment filed on 6/22/2007 overcomes the rejection to claims 14-30 of

previous office action. Therefore, the rejection is withdrawn.

Specification

8.   The amendment filed 6/22/2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Claim 14 has been amended to recite "recordable-type computer-readable media", which does not have a written description or support in the original specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   Claims 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 14 has been amended to recite "recordable-type computer-readable media" but there is no written description or support in the original specification for this newly added material. Applicant is suggest to change "recordable-type computer-readable media" to "computer-storage media" to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 14, 15, 20, 25, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Southam et al. (United States Patent No.: US 6,920,410 B2).

As per claims 1 and 14:

Southam discloses a method for the code generation computing system to

automatically generate code that tests capabilities of a test computing system to use a

message exchange pattern application to engage in message transactions following a

message exchange pattern, the method comprising the following:

-   an act of accessing a message exchange pattern definition (see at least col. 5,

    lines 46-51 "**Once the actual network service WSDL files have been**

    obtained...WSDL files are then used as inputs to a test environment

    generation system" (this means, the WSDL files are accessed); also see at

    least col. 5, lines 36-38 "**mock network services 110 are created with**

    reference to public interface, such as a web service description language

    (WSDL) files" – WSDL is accessed to create mock network services 110) that

defines a plurality of states, the message exchange pattern definition further

having for each of the plurality of states, an indication of one or more valid

messages that conform to the message exchange pattern for that state, an

indication of which computing system may transmit each valid message given the

state, and a state transition indication for at least some of the valid messages

identifying one of the plurality of states to transition to should the valid message

occur (see at least col. 5, lines 49-55 "**these files provide the skeletal data**

structures of the actual network services 108 and therefore describe the

interfaces of the actual network services. The WSDL files identify the

structure of the inputs or requests that the structure of the actual network

services 108 may received, and the output or responses that can be

expected from those inputs or requests" – WSDL files define a plurality of

states (requests and responses). They also identify the network services 103

transmitted (requests and responses) the messages. Requests and responses

in network services 108 are valid messages);

- an act of accessing a state in which the message exchange pattern definition

   allows a valid transmission message to be transmitted by the test computing

   system for the accessed state (see at least col. 5, lines 36-38 "**WSDL files are**

   then used as inputs to a test environment generation system");

- based on the accessed state, automatically performing the act of:

   o generating code that at least simulates transmission of the valid

      transmission message (see at least col. 5, lines 36-38 "**mock network**

> services 110 are created with reference to public interfaces, such as
> a web service description language (WSDL) files"); and

- o transitioning to other code that represents the state to transition to in
  response to transmission of the valid transmission message (see at least
  col. 7, lines 28-44 "**the mock client 102 sends a request to the testee
  service 104. After the request is received, the testee service 104
  directs a related request to an actual network service 108...then
  redirected (rerouted) to a mock network service 110 that emulates
  operation of the actual network service 108 to which the testee
  service 104 attempted to send its request...returns an appropriate
  response to the testee service 104, a separate response may then
  returned to the mock client 102...**" – According to Southam, testee
  service 104 is the other code that represents the state to transition to in
  response to transmission and reception of the valid transmission
  message); and

- o an act of accessing at least one other state in which the message
  exchange pattern definition allows a valid receipt message to be received
  (see at least col. 5, lines 36-38 "**WSDL files are then used as inputs to a
  test environment generation system**"); and

- based on the at least one other accessed state, automatically performing the acts
  of:

- o generating code that simulates the receipt of the valid receipt message
  (see at least col. 6, lines 5-6 **"the mock clients 102 are, for example,
  generated from the WSDL information associated with the testee
  service"** – mock clients 102 contains code that emulate the requests of
  valid message); and

- o transitioning to other code that represents the state to transition to
  response to reception of the valid message (see at least col. 7, lines 28-44
  **"the mock client 102 sends a request to the testee service 104. After
  the request is received, the testee service 104 directs a related
  request to an actual network service 108...then redirected (rerouted)
  to a mock network service 110 that emulates operation of the actual
  network service 108 to which the testee service 104 attempted to
  send its request...returns an appropriate response to the testee
  service 104, a separate response may then returned to the mock
  client 102..."** – According to Southam, testee service 104 is the other
  code that represents the state to transition to in response to transmission
  and reception of the valid transmission message).

As per claims 2 and 15:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above; and further discloses:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates that when in a
  particular state, any one of a plurality of valid transmission messages may be

transmitted (**it is inherent in Southam's approach because WSDL files**

identify the requests and responses (valid messages) of network services

108).

As per claims 7 and 20:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above; and further discloses:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates that when in a

    particular state, any one of a plurality of valid receipt messages may be received

    ("**the WSDL files identify the structure of the inputs or requests that the**

    structure of the actual network services 108 may receive" col. 5, line 42-43).

As per claims 12 and 25:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above; and further discloses:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition is defined using the Web

    Services Description Language (WSDL) standard ("**web service description**

    language (WSDL) files" col. 5, line 37).

As per claim 27:

Southam discloses the computer program product as in claim 14 above; and further

discloses:

- wherein the one or more computer-readable media are physical media

   ("**computer-readable medium is any electronic, magnetic, optical, or other**

   physical device" col. 7, line 3-4).

As per claim 28:

Southam discloses the computer program product as in claim 27 above; and further

discloses:

- wherein the one or more computer-readable media includes system memory

   ("**the memory 204 comprises various program, in software, and/or**

   firmware..." col. 6, line 49-50).

As per claim 29:

Southam discloses the computer program product as in claim 27 above; and further

discloses:

- wherein the one or more computer-readable media includes persistent memory

   ("**the memory 204 includes any one of a combination of volatile memory**

   elements (e.g., random access memory (RAM)..." col. 6, line 26-28).

As per claim 30:

Southam discloses the computer program product as in claim 29 above; and further

discloses:

- wherein the persistent memory is a magnetic disk ("**hard disk**" (hard disk is one

form of magnetic disk) col. 6, line 28).

As per claim 31:

Southam discloses in a code generation computing system that includes one or

more processors to execute computer-executable instructions in system memory, a

method for the code generation computing system to automatically generate code that

tests capabilities of a test computing system to use a message exchange pattern

application to engage in message transactions following a message exchange pattern,

the method comprising the following:

- an act of accessing a message exchange pattern definition that defines a

plurality of states ("**Once the actual network service WSDL files have been**

obtained...WSDL files are then used as inputs to a test environment

generation system" (this means, the WSDL files are accessed) col. 5, lines

46-51; "**mock network services 110 are created with reference to public**

interface, such as a web service description language (WSDL) files" (this

means, WSDL is accessed to create mock network services 110) col. 5, lines 36-

38), the message exchange pattern definition further having for each of the

plurality of states, an indication of one or more valid messages that conform to

the message exchange pattern for that state, an indication of which computing

system may transmit each valid message given the state, and a state transition

indication for at least some of the valid messages identifying one of the plurality

of states to transition to should the valid message occur ("**these files provide the skeletal data structures of the actual network services 108 and therefore describe the interfaces of the actual network services. The WSDL files identify the structure of the inputs or requests that the structure of the actual network services 108 may received, and the output or responses that can be expected from those inputs or requests**" (WSDL files define a plurality of states (requests and responses). They also identify the network services 103 transmitted (requests and responses) the messages. Requests and responses in network services 108 are valid messages) col. 5, lines 49-45); and

- a step to automatically generate message exchange pattern simulation code using the message exchange pattern definition that at least simulates transmission of the valid transmission message (see at least col. 5, lines 36-38 "**one or more mock network services 110 are created with reference to public interfaces, such as a web service description language (WSDL) files**"); and

- transitioning to other code that represents the state to transition to in response to transmission of the valid transmission message (see at least col. 7, lines 28-44 "**the mock client 102 sends a request to the testee service 104. After the request is received, the testee service 104 directs a related request to an actual network service 108...then redirected (rerouted) to a mock network service 110 that emulates operation of the actual network service 108 to which the testee service 104 attempted to send its request...returns an**

appropriate response to the testee service 104, a separate response may then returned to the mock client 102..." – According to Southam, testee service 104 is the other code that represents the state to transition to in response to transmission and reception of the valid transmission message).

As per claim 32:

Southam disclose the method as in claim 31 above; and further discloses:

- wherein the step automatically generate message exchange pattern simulation code using the message exchange pattern definition comprises the following:
  - o for each state in which the message exchange pattern definition allows a valid transmission message to be transmitted by the test computing system, an act of generating code that at least simulates transmission of the valid transmission message, and that transitions to other code that represents the state to transition to should the valid transmission message be transmitted; and for each state in which the message exchange pattern definition allows a valid receipt message to be received, an act of generating code that simulates the receipt of the valid receipt message, and that transitions to other code that represents the state to transition to should the valid receipt message be received (**"the mock clients 102 are, for example, generated from the WSDL information associated with the testee service"** (mock clients 102 contains code that emulate the

requests of valid message) col. 6, line 5-6, see col. 3, line 6-18 for the

mock clients 102).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Southam et al. (United States Patent No.: US

6,920,410 B2), in view of Trevithick et al. (United States Patent Application Publication

No.: US 2002/0116466 A1).

As per claims 3 and 16:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 2 above; and further discloses:

-     wherein the method further comprises automatically generating code for at least

simulating each of the plurality of valid transmission messages ("**the mock**

clients 102 are generated from the WSDL information associated with the

testee service" col. 6, line 5-6; "**a network service can be tested in an**

emulated operating environment by providing mock clients that submit

requests to the network service" col. 2, line 41-43) and performing appropriate

state transitions given the transmission ("**submit requests to the network service**" col. 2, line 43).

Southam does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates for each of the plurality of valid transmission messages for the particular state, a percentage chance that each of the plurality of valid transmission messages will be transmitted given the particular state.

However, Trevithick discloses an analogous method:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates for each of the plurality of valid transmission messages for the particular state, a percentage chance that each of the plurality of valid transmission messages will be transmitted given the particular state ("**the pattern in the messages may corresponding, for example, to a frequency of interaction, a latency in response, a latency in completion, a successful completion ratio (percentage), a nonresponsive ratio (percentage), an unsuccessful ratio (percentage)**" paragraph 007)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southam's approach allowing WSDL files to include percentage of transmission message. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify in order to characterize the members of network based on the pattern message (paragraph 007).

As per claims 4 and 17:

Southam and Trevithick disclose the method as in claim 3 above; and Southam further discloses:

- an act of generating code that generates a pseudo-random value and selects one of the plurality of valid transmission messages for transmission based on the pseudo-random value and on the percentage chance (**"mock clients 102 comprise generic generic, data-driven code (i.e. the logic and functionality of the network service is determined by an underlying database)..."** (Therefore, it is inherent for mock clients 102 to generate a pseudo-random value for transmission message) col. 4, line 50-51).

As per claims 6 and 19:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 5, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein there is also indicated a percentage chance that the invalid transmission messages will be transmitted given the particular state, wherein the method further comprises an act of generating code that generates a pseudo-random value and selects one of the invalid transmission message for transmission based on the pseudo-random value and on the percentage chance.

However, Trevithick disclose an analogous method that indicates percentage chance that the invalid transmission messages will be transmitted given the particular state (**"the pattern in the messages may corresponding, for example, to a frequency of interaction, a latency in response, a latency in completion, a**

successful completion ratio (percentage), a nonresponsive ratio (percentage), an unsuccessful ratio (percentage).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southam's approach allowing WSDL files to include percentage of transmission message in order to characterize the members of network based on the pattern message (paragraph 007). Therefore, Southam's mock network services 110 would have generated a pseudo-random value and select an invalid transmission message for transmission based on the generated pseudo-random value and ratio (percentage).

As per claims 8 and 21:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 7 above; and further disclose:

-   wherein the method further comprises automatically generating code for simulating each of the plurality of valid receipt messages ("**generate the one or more mock network services 110 that are placed in communication with the testee service 104**" col. 6, line 8-9; "**a mock network service 110 that emulates operation of the actual network service 108 to which the testee service 104 attempted to send its request**" col. 7, line 35-37) and performing appropriate state transitions given the transmission ("**emulates operation of the actual network service 108**" col. 7, line 36).

Southam does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates for each of the plurality of valid receipt messages for the particular state, a percentage chance that each of the plurality of valid receipt messages will be received given the particular state.

However, Trevithick discloses an analogous method:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition indicates for each of the plurality of valid receipt messages for the particular state, a percentage chance that each of the plurality of valid receipt messages will be received given the particular state ("**the pattern in the messages may corresponding, for example, to a frequency of interaction, a latency in response, a latency in completion, a successful completion ratio (percentage), a nonresponsive ratio (percentage), an unsuccessful ratio (percentage)**" paragraph 007).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Southam's approach allowing WSDL files to include percentage of transmission message. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify in order to characterize the members of network based on the pattern message (paragraph 007).

As per claims 9 and 22:

Southam and Trevithick disclose the method as in claim 8 above; and Southam further discloses:

-   an act of generating code that generates a pseudo-random value and selects

    one of the plurality of valid receipt messages for simulated receipt based on the

    pseudo-random value and on the percentage chance (**"the mock network**

    services 110, like the mock clients 102, comprise generic, data-driven

    code." (Therefore, it is inherent for mock clients 102 to generate a pseudo-

    random value for transmission message) Col. 4, line 50-51).

As per claims 11 and 24:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 10, but does not explicitly disclose:

-   wherein there is also indicated a percentage chance that the invalid receipt

    message will be received given the particular state, wherein the method further

    comprises an act of generating code that generates a pseudo-random value and

    selects one of the invalid received message for simulated receipt based on the

    pseudo-random value and on the percentage chance.

However, Trevithick disclose an analogous method that indicates percentage

chance that the invalid receipt messages will be received given the particular state ("**the**

pattern in the messages may corresponding, for example, to a frequency of

interaction, a latency in response, a latency in completion, a successful

completion ratio (percentage), a nonresponsive ratio (percentage), an

unsuccessful ratio (percentage).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Southam's approach allowing WSDL files to

include percentage of receipt message in order to characterize the members of network based on the pattern message (paragraph 007). Therefore, Southam's mock network services 110 would have generated a pseudo-random value and select an invalid receipt message for simulated receipt based on the generated pseudo-random value and ratio (percentage).

5.   Claims 5, 10, 18, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southam et al. (United States Patent No.: US 6,920,410 B2).

As per claims 5 and 18:

   Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- . an act of generating code that at least simulates transmission of an invalid transmission message.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that Southam's approach is capable of generating code that simulates (emulates) transmission of an invalid transmission messages.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate code that emulates transmission of an invalid transmission message in Southam's approach because his idea is to emulate transmission of messages. Emulating transmission of an invalid transmission message is the same as emulating transmission of a valid message (the idea is to emulate transmission messages).

As per claims 10 and 23:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- an act of generating code that simulates receipt of an invalid transmission message.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that Southam's approach is generating code that emulates receipt of an transmission messages ("**the WSDL files identify the structure of the inputs or requests that the structure of the actual network services 108 may receive**" col. 5, line 42-43).

Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate code that simulates (emulates) receipt of an invalid transmission message because the emulating receipt of an invalid transmission message is no different from emulating receipt of an valid transmission message. The idea is to emulate transmission messages.

6.   Claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Southam et al. (United States Patent No.: US 6,920,410 B2), in view of Fremantle et al. (United States Patent Application No.: US 2004/0117199 A1).

As per claims 13 and 26:

Southam discloses the method as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the message exchange pattern definition further defines timing policies

   to be imposed when in a particular state.

However, Fremantle discloses an analogous method using a WSDL document to

define time service ("**The time service is described in a WSDL document**" paragraph

0024).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Southam's approach to have time service

included in WSDL files. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

modify because time service ("**specifies a Port Type of Time and binding for the

channel which specifies a transport mechanism of SOAP/HTTP...**" paragraph

0024).

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMIN·

PN
9/4/2007